arXiv:1612.00919v1 [math.NA] 3 Dec 2016

A Group of Immersed Finite Element Spaces For Elliptic Interface Problems

Ruchi Guo and Tao Lin
(ruchi91@vt.edu and tlin@vt.edu)
Department of Mathematics
Virginia Tech

Abstract

We present a unified framework for developing and analysing immersed finite element (IFE) spaces for solving typical elliptic interface problems with interface independent meshes. This framework allows us to construct a group of new IFE spaces with either linear, or bilinear, or the rotated-Q_1 polynomials. Functions in these IFE spaces are locally piecewise polynomials defined according to the sub-elements formed by the interface itself instead of its line approximation. We show that the unisolvence for these IFE spaces follows from the invertibility of the Sherman-Morrison matrix. A group of estimates and identities are established for the interface geometry and shape functions that are applicable to all of these IFE spaces. Most importantly, these fundamental preparations enable us to develop a unified multipoint Taylor expansion procedure for proving that these IFE spaces have the expected optimal approximation capability according to the involved polynomials.

1 Introduction

This article presents a unified framework for developing and analyzing a group of immersed finite element (IFE) spaces that use interface independent meshes (such as highly structured Cartesian meshes) to solve interface problems of the typical second order elliptic partial differential equations:

$$-\nabla \cdot (\beta \nabla u) = f, \quad \text{in } \Omega^- \cup \Omega^+, \tag{1.1}$$

$$u = g, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \tag{1.2}$$

where, without loss of generality, the domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is separated by the interface Γ into two subdomains Ω^+ and Ω^-, the diffusion coefficient $\beta(X)$ is discontinuous such that

$$\beta(X) = \begin{cases} \beta^- & \text{if } X \in \Omega^-, \\ \beta^+ & \text{if } X \in \Omega^+, \end{cases}$$

where $\beta^{\pm}$ are positive constants. In addition, the solution u is assumed to satisfy the jump conditions:

$$[u]_\Gamma = 0, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\left[\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}\right]_\Gamma = 0, \tag{1.4}$$

*Keywords: Interface problems, discontinuous coefficients, finite element spaces, Cartesian mesh.
*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35R05, 65N30, 97N50.

where $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit normal vector to the interface Γ, and for every piece-wise function v defined as

$$v = \begin{cases} v^-(X) & \text{if } X \in \Omega^-, \\ v^+(X) & \text{if } X \in \Omega^+, \end{cases}$$

we adopt the notation $[v]|_\Gamma = v^+|_\Gamma - v^-|_\Gamma$.

It is well known that the standard finite element method can be applied to the interface problems provided that the mesh is formed according the interface, see [2, 8, 11] and references therein. The IFE methods was introduced [31] for those applications where it is preferable to solve interface problems with a mesh independent of the interface, for example, the Particle-In-Cell method for plasma particle simulations [27, 28, 39], the problems with moving interfaces [1, 25, 36], and the electroencephalography forward problem [43]. IFE methods for interface problems of other types of partial differential equations can be found in [1, 25, 26, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41, 45]. There are other types of finite element methods that can use interface independent meshes to solve interface problems, see for example [3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 40]

The IFE spaces developed in this article are extended from the IFE spaces constructed with linear polynomials [17, 29, 30, 32], bilinear polynomials [22, 23, 35], and rotate-Q_1 polynomials [38, 46] using the standard Lagrange type local degrees of freedom imposed either at element vertices as usual or at midpoints of element edges in the Crouzeix-Raviart way [14]. We note that, the local linear IFE space on each triangular interface element constructed here with the Lagrange local degrees of freedom imposed at vertices is very similar to the one recently introduced in [19]. The IFE spaces in this article are new because, locally on each interface element, they are Hsieh-Clough-Tocher type macro finite element functions [7, 13] defined with sub-elements formed by interface curve itself in contrast to those IFE spaces in the literature defined with sub-elements formed by a straight line approximating the interface curve.

Our research presented here is motivated by two issues. The first issue concerns the general $O(h^2)$ order accuracy for a line to approximate a curve which is a fundamental ingredient for the optimal approximation capability for those IFE spaces in the literature. We hope the study of IFE spaces based on curve sub-elements can shade light on the development of higher degree IFE spaces for which the $O(h^2)$ order is not sufficient. The second issue is the attempt to unify the fragmented framework for developing and analyzing the IFE spaces in the literature. For IFE spaces based on different meshes, different polynomials, and different local degrees of freedom, we show that their unisolvence, i.e., the existence and uniqueness of IFE shape functions, can be established through a uniform procedure related with the invertibility of the Sherman-Morrison matrix. We have derived a group of identities for the interface geometry and shape functions that are applicable to all of these IFE spaces, and this enables us to derive error estimates for the interpolation in these new IFE spaces in a general unified multipoint Taylor expansion approach in which, IFE functions defined according to the original interface actually simplifies the analysis because we only need to apply the same arguments to two sub-elements formed by the interface while the analysis for the IFE spaces in the literature has to use a different set of arguments to handle the sub-elements sandwiched between the interface curve and its approximate line. Also, inspired by [19], we have made an effort to show how the error bounds explicitly depend on the curvature of the interface and the ratio between β^- and β^+, which are two important factors effecting the approximation capability of the IFE spaces discussed.

This article consists of 5 additional sections. In the next section we describe common notations and some basic assumptions used in this article. In Section 3, we derive estimates and identities associated with the interface and the jump conditions in an element. From these estimates, we can see how their bounds explicitly depend on curvature of the interface and the ratio between β^- and β^+, and how the mesh size h is subject to the interface curvature. In Section 4 we present generalized multipoint Taylor expansions for piecewise C^2 functions in an interface element. Estimates for the remainders in these expansions are derived in terms of pertinent Sobolev norms. In Section 5, first, we establish the unisolvence of the

immersed finite element based on linear, bilinear, Crouzeix-Raviart and rotated-Q_1 polynomials, i.e., we show the standard Lagrange local degrees of freedom imposed at the nodes of an interface element can uniquely determine an IFE function that satisfies the interface jump conditions in a suitable approximate sense. Then, we show that the IFE shape functions have several desirable properties such as the partition of unity and the critical identities in Theorem 5.3. Finally, with a unified analysis, we show that the IFE spaces have the expected optimal approximation capability. In Section 6, we demonstrate features of these IFE spaces by numerical examples.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the article, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ denotes a bounded domain as a union of finitely many rectangles. The interface curve Γ separates Ω into two subdomains Ω^+ and Ω^- such that $\overline{\Omega} = \overline{\Omega^+} \cup \overline{\Omega^-} \cup \Gamma$. For every measurable subset $\tilde{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$, let $W^{k,p}(\tilde{\Omega})$ be the standard Sobolev spaces on $\tilde{\Omega}$ associated with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{k,p,\tilde{\Omega}}$ and the semi-norm $|v|_{k,p,\tilde{\Omega}} = \|D^\alpha v\|_{0,p,\tilde{\Omega}}$, for $|\alpha| = k$. The corresponding Hilbert space is $H^k(\tilde{\Omega}) = W^{k,2}(\tilde{\Omega})$. When $\tilde{\Omega}^s = \tilde{\Omega} \cap \Omega^s \neq \emptyset, s = \pm$, we let

$$PH^k_{int}(\tilde{\Omega}) = \{u : u|_{\tilde{\Omega}^s} \in H^k(\tilde{\Omega}^s),\ s = \pm;\ [u] = 0 \text{ and } [\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}_\Gamma] = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma \cap \tilde{\Omega}\},$$

$$PC^k_{int}(\tilde{\Omega}) = \{u : u|_{\tilde{\Omega}^s} \in C^k(\tilde{\Omega}^s),\ s = \pm;\ [u] = 0 \text{ and } [\beta \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}_\Gamma] = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma \cap \tilde{\Omega}\}.$$

The norms to be used on $PH^k_{int}(\tilde{\Omega})$ are

$$\|\cdot\|^2_{k,\tilde{\Omega}} = \|\cdot\|^2_{k,\tilde{\Omega}^+} + \|\cdot\|^2_{k,\tilde{\Omega}^-}, \qquad |\cdot|^2_{k,\tilde{\Omega}} = |\cdot|^2_{k,\tilde{\Omega}^+} + |\cdot|^2_{k,\tilde{\Omega}^-},$$

$$\|\cdot\|_{k,\infty,\tilde{\Omega}} = \max(\|\cdot\|_{k,\infty,\tilde{\Omega}^+}\ ,\ \|\cdot\|_{k,\infty,\tilde{\Omega}^-}), \qquad |\cdot|_{k,\infty,\tilde{\Omega}} = \max(|\cdot|_{k,\infty,\tilde{\Omega}^+}\ ,\ |\cdot|_{k,\infty,\tilde{\Omega}^-}).$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a Cartesian triangular or rectangular mesh of the domain Ω with the maximum length of edge h. An element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ is called an interface element provided the interior of T intersects with the interface Γ; otherwise, we name it an non-interface element. We let $\mathcal{T}_h^i$ and $\mathcal{T}_h^n$ be the set of interface elements and non-interface elements, respectively. Similarly, $\mathcal{E}_h^i$ and $\mathcal{E}_h^n$ are sets of interface edges and non-interface edges, respectively. In addition, as in [24], we assume that $\mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies the following hypotheses when the mesh size h is small enough:

(H1) The interface Γ cannot intersect an edge of any element at more than two points unless the edge is part of Γ.

(H2) If Γ intersects the boundary of an element at two points, these intersection points must be on different edges of this element.

(H3) The interface Γ is a piecewise C^2 function, and the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ is formed such that the subset of Γ in every interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ is C^2.

(H4) The interface Γ is smooth enough so that $PC^2_{int}(T)$ is dense in $PH^2_{int}(T)$ for every interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$.

On an element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, we consider the local finite element space (T, Π_T, Σ_T^P) with

$$\Pi_T = \begin{cases} \text{Span}\{1, x, y\}, & \text{for } P_1 \text{ or Crouzeix-Raviart (C-R) finite element functions,} \\ \text{Span}\{1, x, y, xy\}, & \text{for } Q_1 \text{ (bilinear) finite element functions,} \\ \text{Span}\{1, x, y, x^2 - y^2\}, & \text{for rotated-}Q_1 \text{ finite element functions,} \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

$$\Sigma_T^P \quad = \quad \{\psi_T^P(M_i) : i \in \mathcal{I},\ \forall \psi_T^P \in \Pi_T\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \cdots, DOF(T)\}$, $DOF(T) = 3$ or 4 depending on whether T is triangular or rectangular, $M_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$ are the local nodes to determine shape functions on T, and the super script P is to emphasize the Lagrange type degrees of freedom imposed at the points M_is. For P_1 and Q_1 finite elements, $M_i = A_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$ where A_i's are vertices of T. For C-R and rotated-Q_1 finite elements, M_i is the midpoint of the i-th edge of T for $i \in \mathcal{I}$. It is well known [9, 12, 14, 42] that (T, Π_T, Σ_T^P) has a set of shape functions $\psi_i^P(X), i \in \mathcal{I}$ such that

$$\psi_{i,T}^P(M_j) = \delta_{ij}, \quad \left\|\psi_{i,T}^P\right\|_{\infty,T} \leq C, \quad \left\|\nabla\psi_{i,T}^P\right\|_{\infty,T} \leq Ch^{-1}, \ \ i, j \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{2.3}$$

where δ_{ij} is the *Kronecker* delta function.

Throughout this article, with out loss of generality, we assume that $\beta^+ \geqslant \beta^-$ and let $\rho = \beta^-/\beta^+ \leqslant 1$. In addition, on any $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, we use D, E to denote the intersection points of Γ and ∂T and let l be the line connecting DE.

3 Geometric Properties of the Interface

In this section, we discuss geometric properties on interface elements that are useful for developing and analyzing IFE spaces. Let T be an interface element. As illustrated in Figure 3.1, for a point $\widetilde{X}$ on $\Gamma \cap T$, we let $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}) = (\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X}), \tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}))$ be the normal of Γ at $\widetilde{X}$, and we let $\widetilde{X}_\perp \in l$ be the orthogonal projection of $\widetilde{X} \in \Gamma \cap T$ onto the line l. Also, for the line l, we let $\bar{\mathbf{n}} = (\bar{n}_x, \bar{n}_y)$ be its unit normal vector and let $\bar{\mathbf{t}} = (\bar{n}_y, -\bar{n}_x)$ be vector tangential to l. And without loss of generality, we can assume the orientation of all the normal vectors are from T^- to T^+. In addition, we let κ be the maximum curvature of the curve Γ.



Figure 3.1: The local system



Figure 3.2: The geometry of an interface element

For $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, without loss of generality, we can introduce a local coordinate system $(\xi, \eta) = (\xi, \omega(\xi))$ for a suitable function ω such that, in this local system, D is origin and its x-axis is aligned with l, as shown in Figure 3.2. We start from the following lemma which extend similar results in [30]:

Lemma 3.1. *Given any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})$, assume $h\kappa \leqslant \epsilon$, then for any interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, there holds*

$$|w(\xi)| \leqslant 2(1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2}\kappa h^2, \tag{3.1}$$

$$|w'(\xi)| \leqslant \sqrt{2}(1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2}\kappa h. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. In the local system, let ξ_E be the coordinate of the points E. And by the Mean Value Theorem, there is some $\xi_0 \in [0, \xi_E]$ such that $\omega'(\xi_0) = 0$. Consider a function g as well as its derivative

$$g(\xi) = \frac{\omega'(\xi)}{\sqrt{1 + (\omega'(\xi))^2}}, \quad \text{and,} \quad g'(\xi) = \frac{\omega''(\xi)}{(1 + (\omega'(\xi))^2)^{3/2}}.$$

Note that $g'(\xi)$ is the curvature of Γ at ξ; hence, we have $|g'(\xi)| \leq \kappa$. Then, by $g(\xi_0) = 0$, we have $|g(\xi)| = \left| \int_{\xi_0}^{\xi} g'(s) ds \right| \leqslant \int_{\xi_0}^{\xi} |g'(s)| ds \leqslant \sqrt{2}\kappa h = \sqrt{2}\epsilon$, which implies $|\omega'(\xi)| \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{2}\epsilon}{\sqrt{1-2\epsilon^2}}$. By the definition of κ, we have $|\omega''(\xi)| \leqslant (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2}\kappa$.

Now using the Taylor expansion for ω around D leads to $\omega(\xi) = \omega'(0)\xi + \frac{1}{2}\omega''(\bar{\xi})\xi^2$ for some $\bar{\xi} \in [0, \xi_E]$. Note that $\omega(\xi_E) = 0$ shows $\omega'(0) = -\frac{1}{2}\omega''(\bar{\xi}_E))\xi_E$. Thus we have $\omega(\xi) = -\frac{1}{2}\omega''(\bar{\xi}_E))\xi_E\xi + \frac{1}{2}\omega''(\bar{\xi})\xi^2$ and therefore, $|\omega(\xi)| \leqslant 2\|\omega''\|_\infty h^2 \leqslant 2(1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2}\kappa h^2$, which yields (3.1). And using Taylor expansion again for ω' around ξ_0, we have $\omega'(\xi) = \omega''(\tilde{\xi})(\xi - \xi_0)$ for some $\tilde{\xi}$ between ξ_0 and ξ. Finally we obtain $|\omega'(\xi)| \leqslant \sqrt{2}\|\omega''\|h \leqslant \sqrt{2}(1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2}h$. □

The following lemmas provide estimates about various geometric quantities defined at points on $\Gamma \cap T$.

Lemma 3.2. *Given any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})$, assume $h\kappa \leqslant \epsilon$, then for any interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ and any point $\widetilde{X} \in \Gamma \cap T$, the following inequalities hold:*

$$\|\widetilde{X} - \widetilde{X}_\perp\| \leqslant 2(1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2}\kappa h^2, \tag{3.3}$$

and for any $\widetilde{X}_1$, $\widetilde{X}_2 \in \Gamma \cap T$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1) - \mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_2)\| \leqslant \sqrt{2}(1 + (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})\kappa h, \tag{3.4a}$$

$$\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_2) \geqslant 1 - 2(1 + (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})^2\kappa^2 h^2. \tag{3.4b}$$

Proof. Estimates (3.3) directly follows from (3.1). For (3.4a), we assume $\widetilde{X}_1 = (\xi_1, w(\xi_2))$ and $\widetilde{X}_2 = (\xi_2, w(\xi_2))$ in the local system, respectively. Then we have

$$\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (w'(\xi_1))^2}} \begin{pmatrix} -w'(\xi_1) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (w'(\xi_2))^2}} \begin{pmatrix} -w'(\xi_2) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the calculation in Lemma 3.1 and Mean Value Theorem, there is some $\bar{\xi} \in [0, \xi_E]$ such that

$$\left| \frac{w'(\xi_1)}{\sqrt{1 + (w'(\xi_1))^2}} - \frac{w'(\xi_2)}{\sqrt{1 + (w'(\xi_2))^2}} \right| = \frac{|\omega''(\bar{\xi})|}{(1 + (\omega'(\bar{\xi}))^2)^{3/2}} |\xi_1 - \xi_2| \leqslant \sqrt{2}\kappa h$$

and $\tilde{\xi} \in [0, \xi_E]$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (w'(\xi_1))^2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (w'(\xi_2))^2}} \right| = \frac{|\omega'(\tilde{\xi})||\omega''(\tilde{\xi})|}{(1 + (\omega'(\tilde{\xi}))^2)^{3/2}} |\xi_1 - \xi_2| \leqslant 2(1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2}\epsilon\kappa h$$

Then (3.4a) follows by applying these estimates in the local coordinate forms of $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1)$ and $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_2)$. Furthermore, by (3.4a) and

$$\|\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1) - \mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_2)\|^2 = \|\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_2)\|^2 - 2\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_2) = 2 - 2\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_2),$$

we have (3.4b). □

Remark 3.1. *Note that there exists a point* $\widetilde{X}_1 = (\xi_1, w(\xi_1)) \in \Gamma \cap T$ *such that* $w'(\xi_1) = 0$ *which means* $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1) = \bar{\mathbf{n}}$. *Hence, by Lemma 3.2, we have the following estimates for an arbitrary point* $\widetilde{X} \in \Gamma \cap T$*:*

$$\|\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}) - \bar{\mathbf{n}}\| \leqslant \sqrt{2}(1 + (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})\kappa h, \tag{3.5a}$$

$$\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}) \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} \geqslant 1 - 2(1 + (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})^2\kappa^2 h^2. \tag{3.5b}$$

The two lemmas above have suggested a criteria about how small h should be according to the curvature κ so that the related analysis is valid. Therefore, for all discussions from now on, we further assume that

- h is sufficiently small such that for some fixed parameters $\epsilon \in (0, \sqrt{2}/2)$ and $\bar{\kappa} \in (0, 1]$ of one's own choice, there holds

$$h < \min\left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}}}{\sqrt{2}(1 + (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})\kappa}, \ \frac{\epsilon}{\kappa} \right\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Obviously ϵ is the proportion by which we should choose the mesh size h according to the interface curvature κ. Also, by (3.6) and (3.5b), we have

$$\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}) \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} \geq 1 - \bar{\kappa} \tag{3.7}$$

which shows how much the angle between the normal of $\Gamma \cap T$ and $\bar{\mathbf{n}}$ can vary in an interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, a larger value of $\bar{\kappa} \in (0, 1]$ allows $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X})$ to vary more from $\bar{\mathbf{n}}$ up to, but not equal to, 90 degree. Therefore, we will call $\bar{\kappa}$ the angle allowance.

And in the rest of this paper, all the generic constants C are assumed to possibly depend only on the parameter ϵ and $\bar{\kappa}$, but they are independent of the interface location, $\beta^{\pm}$, and the curvature κ.

We now consider some matrices associated with the normal of interface Γ and the normal of l. First, for any $\widetilde{X} \in \Gamma \cap T$, we use the normal $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X})$ to form two matrices:

$$N^s(\widetilde{X}) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) & -\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X}) \\ \beta^s \tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X}) & \beta^s \tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad s = \pm.$$

Since $Det(N^s(\widetilde{X})) = \beta^s, s = \pm$, these matrices are nonsingular; therefore, we can define another two matrices at the point $\widetilde{X} \in \Gamma \cap T$:

$$M^-(\widetilde{X}) = \left(N^+(\widetilde{X})\right)^{-1} N^-(\widetilde{X}) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{n}_y^2(\widetilde{X}) + \rho\tilde{n}_x^2(\widetilde{X}) & (\rho - 1)\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X})\tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) \\ (\rho - 1)\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X})\tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) & \tilde{n}_x^2(\widetilde{X}) + \rho\tilde{n}_y^2(\widetilde{X}) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.8}$$

$$M^+(\widetilde{X}) = \left(N^-(\widetilde{X})\right)^{-1} N^+(\widetilde{X}) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{n}_y^2(\widetilde{X}) + 1/\rho\tilde{n}_x^2(\widetilde{X}) & (1/\rho - 1)\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X})\tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) \\ (1/\rho - 1)\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X})\tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) & \tilde{n}_x^2(\widetilde{X}) + 1/\rho\tilde{n}_y^2(\widetilde{X}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.9}$$

For matrices $M^-(\widetilde{X})$ and $M^+(\widetilde{X})$, we recall from [30] the following results

$$\nabla u^+(\widetilde{X}) = M^-(\widetilde{X})\nabla u^-(\widetilde{X}), \quad \nabla u^-(\widetilde{X}) = M^+(\widetilde{X})\nabla u^+(\widetilde{X}), \ \forall \widetilde{X} \cap T \in \Gamma, \ \ \forall u \in PC^2_{int}(T). \tag{3.10}$$

In addition, for $\widetilde{X} \in \Gamma \cap T$, we can use the normal vectors $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X})$ and $\bar{\mathbf{n}}$ to form the following matrices:

$$\overline{N}^s(\widetilde{X}) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{n}_y & -\bar{n}_x \\ \beta^s \tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X}) & \beta^s \tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) \end{pmatrix}, \ s = \pm.$$

By Remark 3.1, we have

$$Det(\overline{N}^s(\widetilde{X})) = \beta^s \mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}) \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}} \geqslant \beta^s(1 - C\kappa^2 h^2), \quad s = \pm,$$

which means $\overline{N}^s(\widetilde{X})$ are non-singular when h is small enough; hence, we can use them to form

$$\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}) = (\overline{N}^-(\widetilde{X}))^{-1}\overline{N}^+(\widetilde{X}), \quad \overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) = (\overline{N}^+(\widetilde{X}))^{-1}\overline{N}^-(\widetilde{X}). \tag{3.11}$$

Lemma 3.3. *For the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ with h sufficiently small, there exists a constant C independent of interface location, $\beta^{\pm}$, and κ, such that, for two arbitrary points $\widetilde{X}_i, i = 1, 2$ on $\Gamma \cap T$, we have*

$$\|\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}_1)\| \leqslant C, \quad \|\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}_1)\| \leqslant \frac{C}{\rho}, \quad \|M^-(\widetilde{X}_2)\| \leqslant C, \quad \|M^+(\widetilde{X}_2)\| \leqslant \frac{C}{\rho} \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$\|\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}_1) - M^-(\widetilde{X}_2)\| \leqslant C\kappa h, \quad \|\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}_1) - M^+(\widetilde{X}_2)\| \leqslant \frac{C\kappa}{\rho} h \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. (3.12) can be verified directly. We only prove (3.13) for the $-$ case and the arguments for the $+$ case are similar. For simplicity, we denote $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_i) = (\tilde{n}_{ix}, \tilde{n}_{iy})$, $i = 1, 2$. Then by direct calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}_1) - M^-(\widetilde{X}_2) = &\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{n}_{1y}\bar{n}_y - \tilde{n}_{2y}^2 + \rho(\tilde{n}_{1x}\bar{n}_x - \tilde{n}_{2x}^2) & (\rho-1)(\tilde{n}_{1y}\bar{n}_x - \tilde{n}_{2x}\tilde{n}_{2y}) \\ (\rho-1)(\tilde{n}_{1x}\bar{n}_y - \tilde{n}_{2x}\tilde{n}_{2y}) & \tilde{n}_{1x}\bar{n}_x - n_{2x}^2 + \rho(\tilde{n}_{1y}\bar{n}_y - \tilde{n}_{2y}^2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \frac{1 - \bar{\mathbf{n}}\cdot\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1)}{\bar{\mathbf{n}}\cdot\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}_1)} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{n}_{1y}\bar{n}_y + \rho\tilde{n}_{1x}\bar{n}_x & (\rho-1)\tilde{n}_{1y}\bar{n}_x \\ (\rho-1)\tilde{n}_{1x}\bar{n}_y & \tilde{n}_{1x}\bar{n}_x + \rho\tilde{n}_{1y}\bar{n}_y \end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

By the triangular inequality, (3.4a), (3.5b), (3.6), and $\rho \leqslant 1$, we can verify that $\|\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}_1) - M^-(\widetilde{X}_2)\| \leqslant C\kappa h$ for a constant C independent of interface location, $\beta^{\pm}$, and κ. □

The following lemmas provide a group of identities on interface elements.

Lemma 3.4. *For the mesh $\mathcal{T}_h$ with h sufficiently small, the following results hold for all $\widetilde{X} \in \Gamma$*

- *$\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X})$ and $\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X})$ are inverse matrices to each other, i.e.,*

$$\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X})\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}) = I, \quad \overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X})\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) = I. \tag{3.14}$$

- *Matrix $(\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}))^T$ has two eigenvalues 1 and ρ with the corresponding eigenvectors $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ and $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X})$, i.e.,*

$$\left(\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X})\right)^T \bar{\mathbf{t}} = \bar{\mathbf{t}}, \quad \left(\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X})\right)^T \mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}) = \rho\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}). \tag{3.15}$$

- *Similarly, matrix $(\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}))^T$ has two eigenvalues 1 and $1/\rho$ with the corresponding eigenvectors $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ and $\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X})$, respectively, i.e.,*

$$\left(\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X})\right)^T \bar{\mathbf{t}} = \bar{\mathbf{t}}, \quad \left(\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X})\right)^T \mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}) = \frac{1}{\rho}\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}). \tag{3.16}$$

Proof. First it is easy to see that $\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X})\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}) = (\overline{N}^-(\widetilde{X}))^{-1}\overline{N}^+(\widetilde{X})(\overline{N}^+(\widetilde{X}))^{-1}\overline{N}^-(\widetilde{X}) = I$. Next by direct calculation, we have

$$\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) = \frac{1}{\bar{n}_x\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X}) + \bar{n}_y\tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X})} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{n}_y\tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) + \rho\bar{n}_x\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X}) & -\bar{n}_x\tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) + \rho\bar{n}_x\tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) \\ -\bar{n}_y\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X}) + \rho\bar{n}_y\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X}) & \bar{n}_x\tilde{n}_x(\widetilde{X}) + \rho\bar{n}_y\tilde{n}_y(\widetilde{X}) \end{pmatrix}$$

from which we can easily verify that $(\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}))^T\bar{\mathbf{t}} = \bar{\mathbf{t}}$ and $(\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}))^T\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X}) = \rho\,\mathbf{n}(\widetilde{X})$. The results about $(\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}))^T$ follow from the fact $(\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}))^T(\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}))^T = I$. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a mesh with h sufficiently small. Let $P \in \Omega$ and $\widetilde{X}$ be an arbitrary point on $\Gamma \cap T$. Then the following vectors are independent of $\overline{X} \in l$:*

$$(\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}) - I)^T(P - \overline{X}) \quad \textit{and} \quad (\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) - I)^T(P - \overline{X}).$$

Proof. For two arbitrary points $\overline{X}_i \in l, i = 1, 2$, $\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2$ is a scalar multiple of $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$. Hence, by Lemma 3.4,

$$(\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) - I)^T(P - \overline{X}_1) - (\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) - I)^T(P - \overline{X}_2) = (\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) - I)^T(\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2) = 0$$

which leads to $(\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) - I)^T(P - \overline{X}_1) = (\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) - I)^T(P - \overline{X}_2)$. Therefore $(\overline{M}^-(\widetilde{X}) - I)^T(P - \overline{X})$ does not change when $\overline{X} \in l$ varies. The result for $(\overline{M}^+(\widetilde{X}) - I)^T(P - \overline{X})$ can be proven similarly. □

4 Multipoint Taylor Expansions on Interface Elements

In this section, by extending those in [22, 23, 30, 44, 46], we present multipoint Taylor expansions in more general formats for a function $u \in PC^2_{int}(T)$ over an arbitrary interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, in which $u(M_i), i \in \mathcal{I}$ is described in terms of u and its derivatives at $x \in T^s, s = \pm$. We also derive bounds for the remainders in these expansions. And as in [23], we call a point $X \in T$ an obscure point if one of the lines $\overline{XM_i}, 1 \le i \le DOF(T)$ can intersect Γ more than once. To facilitate a clear expository of main ideas in our analysis, we present error estimation only for interface elements without any obscure points. For the case containing obscure points, we can use a first order expansion for u and use the argument that the measure of obscure points is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(h^3)$.

First, we partition $\mathcal{I}$ into two index sets: $\mathcal{I}^+ = \{i : M_i \in T^+\}$ and $\mathcal{I}^- = \{i : M_i \in T^-\}$ according to the locations of $M_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$. For every $X \in T$, we let $Y_i(t, X) = tM_i + (1 - t)X$. When X and M_i are on different sides of Γ, we let $\tilde{t}_i = \tilde{t}_i(X) \in [0, 1]$ such that $\widetilde{Y}_i = Y_i(\tilde{t}_i, X)$ is on the curve $\Gamma \cap T$, see Figure 4.1 for an illustration for the element on which the rotated-Q_1 finite elements are considered. When M_i and X are on the same side of Γ, by the standard second order Taylor expansion of $u \in PC^2_{int}(T)$, we have

$$u^s(M_i) = u^s(X) + \nabla u^s(X) \cdot (M_i - X) + R_i^s(X), \ i \in \mathcal{I}^s, s = \pm, \ \forall X \in T^s, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\text{with} \quad R_i^s(X) = \int_0^1 (1 - t)\frac{d^2}{dt^2} u^s(Y_i(t, X))dt, \ i \in \mathcal{I}^s, \ \forall X \in T^s. \tag{4.2}$$



Figure 4.1: The expansion of u in a rectangular interface element

In the following discussion, we denote $s = \pm, s' = \mp$, i.e., s and s' take opposite signs whenever a formula have them both. When, M_i and X are on different sides of Γ, the expansions in [22, 23, 30, 46] can be generalized to the following format for $u \in PC^2_{int}(T)$:

$$\begin{aligned} u^{s'}(M_i) =& u^s(X) + \nabla u^s(X) \cdot (M_i - X) + \left(\left(M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - I \right) \nabla u^s(X) \right) \cdot (M_i - \widetilde{Y}_i) \\ &+ R_i^s(X),\ i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'},\ \forall X \in T^s, \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

with

$$\begin{cases} R_i^s(X) = R_{i1}^s(X) + R_{i2}^s(X) + R_{i3}^s(X),\ i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}, X \in T^s, \\ R_{i1}^s(X) = \int_0^{\tilde{t}_i} (1-t) \frac{d^2 u^s}{dt^2}(Y_i(t,X))dt, \quad R_{i2}^s(X) = \int_{\tilde{t}_i}^1 (1-t) \frac{d^2 u^{s'}}{dt^2}(Y_i(t,X))dt,\ i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}, X \in T^s, \\ R_{i3}^s(X) = (1-\tilde{t}_i) \int_0^{\tilde{t}_i} \frac{d}{dt} \left((M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - I) \nabla u^s(Y_i(t,X)) \cdot (M_i - X) \right) dt,\ i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}, X \in T^s, \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

where $M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i)$ are from (3.8) and (3.9). We proceed to estimate remainders in (4.1) and (4.3).

Lemma 4.1. *Assume $u \in PC^2_{int}(T)$. Then there exist constants $C > 0$ independent of the interface location and $\beta^{\pm}$ such that*

$$\int_{T^s} (1-t)^2 |u_{d_1 d_2}(Y_i(t,X))|^2 dX \leqslant C |u|^2_{2,T},\ s = \pm\ \forall t \in [0,1], \tag{4.5}$$

where $d_1 = x$ or y and $d_2 = x$ or y.

Proof. Let $M_i = (x_i, y_i), i \in \mathcal{I}$ and let $\xi = t x_i + (1-t)x$ and $\eta = t y_i + (1-t)y$. For each fixed $t \in [0,1]$, define

$$T^s(t) = \{ tM_i + (1-t)X \mid X \in T^s \}. \tag{4.6}$$

Since $T^s(t) \subseteq T, s = \pm$, we have

$$\int_{T^s} (1-t)^2 |u_{d_1 d_2}(Y(t,X))|^2 dX = \int_{T^s(t)} (1-t)^2 u^2_{d_1 d_2}(\xi,\eta)(1-t)^{-2} d\xi d\eta \leqslant |u|^2_{2,T}$$

which leads to (4.5). □

By a direct calculation we have

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} u^s(Y_i(t,X)) = (M_i - X)^T H_u^s(Y_i(t,X))(M_i - X),\ s = \pm, \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$H_u^s(Y_i(t,X)) = \begin{pmatrix} u^s_{xx}(Y_i(t,x)) & u^s_{xy}(Y_i(t,x)) \\ u^s_{yx}(Y_i(t,x)) & u^s_{yy}(Y_i(t,x)) \end{pmatrix},\ s = \pm,$$

is the Hessian matrix of u^s. We are now ready to derive bounds for the remainders in the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume $u \in PC^2_{int}(T)$, there exist constants $C > 0$ independent of the location of the interface and $\beta^{\pm}$ such that*

$$\|R_i^s\|_{0,T^s} \leqslant C h^2 |u|_{2,T}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}^s,\ s = \pm, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\|R_{i1}^s\|_{0,T^s} \leqslant C h^2 |u|_{2,T}, \quad \|R_{i2}^s\|_{0,T^s} \leqslant C h^2 |u|_{2,T}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'},\ s = \pm. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. According to (4.2) and (4.7), for $s = \pm$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|R_i^s\|_{0,T^s} =& \left(\int_{T^s} \left(\int_0^1 (1-t)(M_i - X) H_u^s(Y_i(t,X))(M_i - X) dt \right)^2 dX \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leqslant & Ch^2 \int_0^1 \left(\int_{T^s} (1-t)^2 (|u_{xx}^s(Y_i(t,X))|^2 + |u_{xy}^s(Y_i(t,X))|^2 + |u_{yy}^s(Y_i(t,X))|^2) dX \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt.\end{aligned}$$

Then (4.8) follows from Lemma 4.1. Estimate (4.9) can be derived similarly. □

Moreover, note that for $i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}, X \in T^s$ and $t \in [0, \tilde{t}_i(X)]$, it can be verified that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left((M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - I) \nabla u^s(Y_i(t,X)) \cdot (M_i - X) \right) = (M_i - X)^T H_u^s(Y_i(t,X))(M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - I)^T (M_i - X). \quad (4.10)$$

Lemma 4.3. *Assume $u \in PC_{int}^2(T)$, there exist constants $C > 0$ independent of the interface location and $\beta^{\pm}$ such that*

$$\|R_{i3}^-\|_{0,T^-} \leqslant Ch^2 |u|_{2,T}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}^+, \qquad \|R_{i3}^+\|_{0,T^+} \leqslant \frac{C}{\rho} h^2 |u|_{2,T}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}^-. \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. We only provide the proof of $\|R_{i3}^-\|_{0,T^-}$ and the argument for $\|R_{i3}^+\|_{0,T^+}$ is similar. According to (4.10) and the fact $0 \leqslant 1 - \tilde{t}_i(X) \leqslant 1 - t$ for any $t \in [0, \tilde{t}_i(X)]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|R_{i3}^-\|_{0,T^-} =& \left(\int_{T^-} (1 - \tilde{t}_i(X))^2 \left(\int_0^{\tilde{t}_i(X)} (M_i - X)^T H_u^-(Y_i(t,X))(M^-(\widetilde{Y}_i) - I)^T (M_i - X) dt \right)^2 dX \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leqslant & Ch^2 \left(\int_{T^-} \left(\int_0^1 |1-t| \left(\left| u_{xx}^-(Y_i(t,X)) \right| + \left| u_{xy}^-(Y_i(t,X)) \right| + \left| u_{yy}^-(Y_i(t,X)) \right| \right) dt \right)^2 dX \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \leqslant & Ch^2 \int_0^1 \left(\int_{T^-} (1-t)^2 \big(|u_{xx}^-(Y_i(t,X))|^2 + |u_{xy}^-(Y_i(t,X))|^2 + |u_{yy}^-(Y_i(t,X))|^2 \big) dX \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt.\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact $\rho \leqslant 1$. Then applying the estimates in Lemma 4.1 to the above leads to (4.11). □

5 IFE Spaces and Their Properties

In this section, we discuss IFE spaces constructed from the related finite element space (T, Π_T, Σ_T^P) for $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$. We will first address the unisolvence of the immersed finite elements on interface elements. We will then present a few fundamental properties of IFE functions. Moreover, we will show that these IFE spaces have the optimal approximation capability according to the polynomials used to constructed them.

5.1 Local IFE spaces

First, on each element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the standard finite element (T, Π_T, Σ_T^P) leads to the following local finite element space:

$$S_h^P(T) = \text{Span}\{\psi_{i,T}^P : \ i \in \mathcal{I}\}, \quad (5.1)$$

where $\psi_{i,T}^P, i \in \mathcal{I}$ are the shape functions satisfying (2.3). This local finite element space is then naturally used as the local IFE space on every non-interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^n$. Therefore, our effort here focuses

on the local IFE space on interface elements. We will discuss the unisolvence, i.e., we will show that the local degrees of freedom Σ_T^P can uniquely determine an IFE function with a suitable set of interface jump conditions. The unisolvence guarantees the existence and uniqueness of IFE shape functions that can span the local IFE space on interface elements.

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ be a typical interface element with vertices $A_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$\begin{array}{llll} A_1=(0,0), & A_2=(h,0), & A_3=(h,h), & (T \text{ is a triangular element}), \\ A_1=(0,0), & A_2=(h,0), & A_3=(h,h), \quad A_4=(0,h), & (T \text{ is a rectangular element}), \end{array} \tag{5.2}$$

and the edges of T are denoted as

$$\begin{array}{llll} b_1=\overline{A_1A_2}, & b_2=\overline{A_2A_3}, & b_3=\overline{A_3A_1}, & (T \text{ is a triangular element}), \\ b_1=\overline{A_1A_2}, & b_2=\overline{A_2A_3}, & b_3=\overline{A_3A_4}, \quad b_4=\overline{A_4A_1}, & (T \text{ is a rectangular element}). \end{array} \tag{5.3}$$

On each interface element T, we consider IFE functions in the following piecewise polynomial format:

$$\phi_T^P(X) = \begin{cases} {\phi_T^P}^-(X) = \phi_T^-(X) \in \Pi_T & \text{if } X \in T^-, \\ {\phi_T^P}^+(X) = \phi_T^+(X) \in \Pi_T & \text{if } X \in T^+, \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

such that it can satisfy the jump conditions (1.3) and (1.4) in an approximate sense as follow:

$$\begin{cases} \phi_T^-|_l = \phi_T^+|_l, & (T \text{ is a triangular element}), \\ \phi_T^-|_l = \phi_T^+|_l, \quad d(\phi_T^-) = d(\phi_T^+), & (T \text{ is a rectangular element}), \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

$$\beta^- \nabla \phi_T^-(F) \cdot \mathbf{n}(F) = \beta^+ \nabla \phi_T^+(F) \cdot \mathbf{n}(F), \tag{5.6}$$

where $d(p)$ denotes the coefficient in the second degree term for $p \in \Pi_T$ and F is an arbitrary point on $\Gamma \cap T$. For an IFE function ϕ_T^P such that

$$\phi_T^P(M_i) = v_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{5.7}$$

we can first expand ϕ_T^P on the subelement with more degrees of freedom, i.e., on T^+ with the assumption that $|\mathcal{I}^+| \geq |\mathcal{I}^-|$ without loss of generality, and the condition (5.5) then implies that

$$\phi_T^P(X) = \begin{cases} {\phi_T^P}^-(X) = {\phi_T^P}^+(X) + c_0 L(X) & \text{if } X \in T^-, \\ {\phi_T^P}^+(X) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^-} c_i \psi_{i,T}^P(X) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^+} v_i \psi_{i,T}^P(X) & \text{if } X \in T^+, \end{cases} \tag{5.8}$$

where the function

$$L(X) = \bar{\mathbf{n}} \cdot (X - D) \tag{5.9}$$

is such that $L(X) = 0$ is the equation of the line l and $\nabla L(X) = \bar{\mathbf{n}}$.

Recall from Remark 3.1, $\nabla L(F) \cdot \mathbf{n}(F) = \bar{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \mathbf{n}(F) \geqslant 1 - \bar{\kappa} > 0$, when h is small enough; hence

$$\mu = \left(\frac{1}{\rho} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{\bar{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \mathbf{n}(F)} \tag{5.10}$$

is well defined, and, by $\rho \leqslant 1$, we have

$$0 \leqslant \mu \leqslant \left(\frac{1}{\rho} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{1 - \bar{\kappa}}. \tag{5.11}$$

By condition (5.6), we then have

$$c_0 = \mu \left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} c_i \nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} v_i \nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) \right). \tag{5.12}$$

Putting this formula for c_0 in formula (5.8) for $\phi_T^P(X)$ and setting $\phi_T^{P\,-}(M_j) = v_j$ for $j \in \mathcal{I}^-$ leads to the following linear system for $c_i, i \in \mathcal{I}^-$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} \left(\psi_{i,T}^P(M_j) + \mu\nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F)L(M_j)\right) c_i \\ =&v_j - \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} \left(\psi_{i,T}^P(M_j) + \mu\nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F)L(M_j)\right) v_i, \quad j\in\mathcal{I}^-. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Since $\psi_{i,T}^P(M_j) = \delta_{ij}$, for $i, j \in \mathcal{I}^-$, we can write the linear system (5.13) in the following matrix form:

$$(I + \mu\,\boldsymbol{\delta}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T)\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b}, \tag{5.14}$$

where $\mathbf{c} = (c_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \left(\nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F)\right)_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-}, \quad \boldsymbol{\delta} = (L(M_i))_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} \tag{5.15}$$

and

$$\mathbf{b} = \left(v_i - \mu L(M_i) \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}^+} \nabla\psi_{j,T}^P(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) v_j \right)_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} \tag{5.16}$$

are all column vectors. We proceed to show that $\phi_T^P(X)$, i.e., its coefficients $c_0, \mathbf{c}$ are uniquely determined. We need the following two lemmas. Let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\nabla\psi_{i,T}(F_\perp)\cdot\bar{\mathbf{n}})_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-}$.

Lemma 5.1. *For all the interface elements, we have $\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta} \in [0,1]$. And for the linear and bilinear $\psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}$, it holds*

$$|L(M_i)| < 2h\sqrt{\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^-. \tag{5.17}$$

Furthermore, for the bilinear $\psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}$, if F is chosen to be such that $F_\perp$ is the mid-point of the line $\overline{DE}$, then it holds

$$|L(M_i)| < 2h\,\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}^-. \tag{5.18}$$

Proof. We only give the proof for the case in which Π_T is the rotated-Q_1 polynomial space, the interface element T is such that $\mathcal{I}^- = \{1\}$ and $\mathcal{I}^+ = \{2,3,4\}$ with $D = (hd, 0)$ and $E = (0, he)$ for some $d \in [1/2, 1]$ and $e \in [0, 1/2]$. Similar arguments apply to all other cases. First, $\bar{\mathbf{n}} = (e,d)/\sqrt{d^2+e^2}$. Hence, $F_\perp = (td, e(h-t))$ for some $t \in (0,h)$. By direct calculation, we have

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta} = \frac{1}{h(d^2+e^2)}\left[h(e-2d) - 2(2t-h)de\right](\frac{1}{2}-d)e, \tag{5.19}$$

Note that

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta} = \frac{e-2d+2de}{d^2+e^2}(\frac{1}{2}-d)e \in [0,1] \text{ if } t=0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta} = \frac{e-2d-2de}{d^2+e^2}(\frac{1}{2}-d)e \in [0,1] \text{ if } t=h,$$

which leads to $\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta} \in [0,1]$ because $\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is a linear function of t according to (5.19). And (5.17) and (5.18) follow from similar calculation. □

Lemma 5.2. *For h small enough, we have*

$$1 + \mu\, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} \geqslant 1 - 4\mu\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}}. \tag{5.20}$$

And for the linear and Crouzeix-Raviart $\psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}$, if F is chosen such that $\mathbf{n}(F) = \bar{\mathbf{n}}$, then

$$1 + \mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} = 1 + \mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} \geqslant 1. \tag{5.21}$$

In addition, for the bilinear $\psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}$, if F is chosen such that $F_\perp$ is the midpoint of $\overline{DE}$, then

$$1 + \mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} \geqslant 1 + \mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}(1 - 4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}}). \tag{5.22}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, (2.3), and Remark 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F) \cdot \mathbf{n}(F) - \nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F_\perp) \cdot \bar{\mathbf{n}}| \\
\leqslant &|(\nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F) - \nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F_\perp)) \cdot \mathbf{n}(F)| + |\nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F_\perp) \cdot (\mathbf{n}(F) - \bar{\mathbf{n}})| \\
\leqslant &\|(\nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F) - \nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F_\perp))\| \cdot \|\mathbf{n}(F)\| + \|\nabla\psi_{i,T}^P(F_\perp)\| \cdot \|(\mathbf{n}(F) - \bar{\mathbf{n}})\| \\
\leqslant &4(1 + (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})\kappa,\ i \in \mathcal{I}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies $\|\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\| \leq 2(1 + 2(1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})\kappa$. For all the types of finite elements considered in this article, by $\|L\|_{\infty,T} \leq \sqrt{2}h$, we have $\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\| \leq \sqrt{2}h$ and therefore,

$$\mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} = \mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} + \mu(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T - \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T)\boldsymbol{\delta} \geq \mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} - 4\sqrt{2}(1 + (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})\kappa\mu h,$$

which yields (5.20) by the assumption (3.6). Furthermore, for linear finite elements, if F is chosen such that $\mathbf{n}(F) = \bar{\mathbf{n}}$, then $\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}$; thus Lemma 5.1 and (5.11) imply $1 + \mu\,\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} \geqslant 1$. For the bilinear finite elements, if F is chosen such that $F_\perp$ is the mid point of $\overline{DE}$, then by (5.18) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} = \mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} + \mu(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T - \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T)\boldsymbol{\delta} \quad &\geq \quad \mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T \boldsymbol{\delta} - \mu 4(1 + (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})\kappa(2h\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}) \\
&\geq \quad \mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}(1 - 8(1 + (1 - 2\epsilon^2)^{-3/2})\kappa h),
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to (5.22) by the assumption (3.6). □

Theorem 5.1 (Unisolvence). *Let $\mathcal{T}_h$ be a mesh satisfying* (3.6) *with $\bar{\kappa}$ specified therein for linear and Crouzeix-Raviart $\psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}$ and*

$$\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}} < \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}, \quad \textit{for bilinear} \quad \psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{5.23}$$

and for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$

$$\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}} \leq \frac{\rho(1 - \lambda)}{4 - (3 + \lambda)\rho}, \quad \textit{for rotated-}Q_1 \quad \psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}. \tag{5.24}$$

In addition, we assume F and $F_\perp$ are chosen such estimates given Lemma 5.2 hold. Then, given any vector $v = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4$, there exists one and only one IFE function ϕ_T^P in the form of (5.4) *satisfying* (5.5)-(5.7).

Proof. For linear and Crouzeix-Raviart $\psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}$, by (5.21) in Lemma 5.2, we have $1 + \mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq 0$. For bilinear linear $\psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}$, by (5.23), we have $1 - 4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}} > 0$ which leads to $1 + \mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq 0$ because of (5.22) in Lemma 5.2. Similarly, for rotated-Q_1 $\psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}$, by (5.24), we have

$$1 - 4\mu\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}} \geq 1 - \frac{4\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}}}{1-\bar{\kappa}}\left(\frac{1}{\rho} - 1\right) \geq \lambda \tag{5.25}$$

which, by (5.20) in Lemma 5.2, leads to $1 + \mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T\boldsymbol{\delta} \neq 0$ again. Hence, by well known results about the *Sherman-Morrison* formula, the matrix in the linear system (5.14) is nonsingular which together with (5.12) lead to the existence and uniqueness for coefficients $c_i, i \in \mathcal{I}^-$ and c_0 of $\phi_T^P(X)$. □

Remark 5.1. *Theorem 5.1 provides guidelines on the choice for the angle allowance parameter $\bar{\kappa}$ needed in* (3.6) *for bilinear and rotated-Q_1 $\psi_{i,T}, i \in \mathcal{I}$. In the bilinear case, condition* (5.23) *suggests an upper bound for $\bar{\kappa}$ which is nevertheless independent of ρ. In the rotated-Q_1 case, condition* (5.24) *leads to the following upper bound for $\bar{\kappa}$: $\sqrt{\bar{\kappa}} < \frac{\rho}{4-3\rho}$ which depends on ρ, and this restriction on $\bar{\kappa}$ becomes severer when ρ approaches* 0.

Remark 5.2. *Under the conditions given in Theorem 5.1, we can apply the Sherman-Morrison formula to express the solution to* (5.14) *explicitly as*

$$\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b} - \mu\frac{(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T\mathbf{b})\boldsymbol{\delta}}{1 + \mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}} \tag{5.26}$$

which facilitate both analysis and computation for these IFE spaces.

On each interface element T, Theorem 5.1 guarantees the existence and uniqueness of the IFE shape functions $\phi_{i,T}^P$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$ satisfying (5.4)-(5.6) such that

$$\phi_{i,T}^P(M_j) = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j \in \mathcal{I}, \tag{5.27}$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta function. Therefore, we can define the local IFE space on each interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ as

$$S_h^P(T) = \text{Span}\{\phi_{i,T}^P : \ i \in \mathcal{I}\}. \tag{5.28}$$

5.2 Properties of the IFE Shape Functions

In this section, we present some fundamental properties of IFE shape functions.

Theorem 5.2 (Bounds of IFE shape functions). *Under the conditions given in Theorem 5.1, we have the following estimates:*

- *For rotated-Q_1 and Crouzeix-Raviart $\phi_{i,T}^P$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$,, $\forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$,*

$$|\phi_{i,T}^P|_{k,\infty,T} \leqslant \frac{C}{\rho}h^{-k}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}, k = 0, 1, \ \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i, \tag{5.29}$$

  where C depends also on λ for rotated-Q_1 case;

- *For linear $\phi_{i,T}^P$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $\forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$,*

$$|\phi_{i,T}^P|_{k,\infty,T^+} \leqslant \frac{C}{\sqrt{\rho}}h^{-k}, \quad |\phi_{i,T}^P|_{k,\infty,T^-} \leqslant \frac{C}{\rho}h^{-k}, \quad k = 0, 1; \tag{5.30}$$

- *For bilinear $\phi^P_{i,T}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $\forall\, T \in \mathcal{T}^i_h$,*

$$|\phi^P_{i,T}|_{k,\infty,T^+} \leqslant Ch^{-k}, \quad |\phi^P_{i,T}|_{k,\infty,T^-} \leqslant \frac{C}{\rho}h^{-k}, \quad k = 0, 1. \tag{5.31}$$

Proof. For convenience, we let $\mathbf{e} = (e_j)_{j\in\mathcal{I}}$ be the unit vector constructing the basis functions $\phi^P_{i,T}$, which could be $(1, 0\cdots, 0)$, $(0, 1\cdots, 0)$, $\cdots$, $(0, 0\cdots, 1)$, and $\mathbf{e}^- = (e_j)_{j\in\mathcal{I}^-}$. Let $w = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}^+} \nabla\psi^P_{j,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F)e_j$. Then (5.16) implies $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{e}^- - \mu w\boldsymbol{\delta}$ and plugging it into the *Sherman-Morrison* formula (5.26) leads to

$$\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{e}^- - \mu\frac{(w + \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T\mathbf{e}^-)\boldsymbol{\delta}}{1 + \mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \tag{5.32}$$

and plugging (5.32) into (5.12) yields

$$c_0 = \frac{\mu(w + \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T\mathbf{e}^-)}{1 + \mu\boldsymbol{\gamma}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}}. \tag{5.33}$$

Since $\|\nabla\psi^P_{i,T}\|_{\infty,T} \leqslant Ch^{-1},\ i \in \mathcal{I},\ \|L\|_{\infty,T} < Ch,\ |\nabla L\|_{\infty,T} < C$ for some constants C independent of the location of the interface and $\beta^\pm$, we have $\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| \leq Ch^{-1},\ \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\| \leq Ch$, $\|\mathbf{b}\| \leq C$ and $|w| \leqslant Ch^{-1}$.

When $\phi^P_{i,T}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$ are rotated-Q_1 polynomials, we can apply (5.11) and (5.24) to (5.32) to obtain:

$$\|\mathbf{c}\| \leq \|\mathbf{e}^-\| + \frac{1}{1-\bar\kappa}\left(\frac{1}{\rho} - 1\right)\frac{(|w| + \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|\|\mathbf{e}^-\|)\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|}{1 - \frac{4\sqrt{\bar\kappa}}{1-\bar\kappa}\left(\frac{1}{\rho} - 1\right)} \leq \frac{C}{\rho}. \tag{5.34}$$

Applying similar arguments to (5.33) we have $\|c_0\| < C/\rho$. Constant C in these inequalities depends on λ. Finally, (5.29) follows from applying these bounds for $\mathbf{c}$ and $\mathbf{c}_0$ and the bounds for standard finite element basis function $\psi_{i,T}$ to the formula of $\phi^P_{i,T}$ given in (5.8). When $\phi^P_{i,T}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$ are Crouzeix-Raviart polynomials, we apply (5.11) and (5.21) to (5.32) and (5.33) to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{c}\| &\leq \|\mathbf{e}^-\| + \frac{1}{1-\bar\kappa}\left(\frac{1}{\rho} - 1\right)(|w| + \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|\|\mathbf{e}^-\|)\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\| \leq \frac{C}{\rho}, \\ |c_0| &\leq \frac{1}{1-\bar\kappa}\left(\frac{1}{\rho} - 1\right)(|w| + \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|\|\mathbf{e}^-\|)\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\| \leq \frac{C}{\rho}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

Then (5.29) in this case follows from the same arguments used above for the rotated-Q_1 case.

When $\phi^P_{i,T}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$ are linear polynomials, by using (5.17) and Lemma 5.2 in (5.32), we have

$$\|\mathbf{c}\| \leq C + C\frac{\mu\sqrt{\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}}}{1 + \mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}} \leq C + C\max(1, \sqrt{\mu}) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\rho}}. \tag{5.36}$$

Also, estimate in (5.35) is valid. Then, estimates in (5.30) follows from applying (5.36) and (5.35) to (5.8).

Finally, when $\phi^P_{i,T}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$ are bilinear polynomials, we can apply (5.18) and Lemma 5.2 in (5.32) to have

$$\|\mathbf{c}\| < C + C\frac{\mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}}{1 + (1 - 4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\bar\kappa})\mu\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^T\boldsymbol{\delta}} < C, \tag{5.37}$$

because $1 - 4\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\bar\kappa}$ is a positive constant by the condition (5.23). Also, the estimates for c_0 is similar to (5.35). Then, (5.31) follows from applying these bounds for $\mathbf{c}$ and c_0 to (5.8). □

Lemma 5.3 (Partition of Unity). *On every interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, we have*

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \phi_{i,T}^P(X) \equiv 1, \tag{5.38}$$

$$\nabla\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \phi_{i,T}^P(X)\right) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \nabla\phi_{i,T}^P(X) = 0. \tag{5.39}$$

Proof. Let $p(X) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \phi_{i,T}^P(X)$ and $q(X) = 1$. Obviously both $p(X)$ and $q(X)$ are in the format of (5.4) and they satisfy (5.5) and (5.6). Furthermore, it is easy to verify that $p(M_i) = 1 = q(M_i), i \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence,

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \phi_{i,T}^P(X) = p(X) = q(X) = 1$$

according to the unisolvence stated in Theorem 5.1. Property (5.39) follows from (5.38) directly. □

Now, on every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, choosing arbitrary points $\overline{X}_i \in l, i \in \mathcal{I}$, we can construct two vector functions as follows:

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_1(X) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} (M_i - X)\phi_{i,T}^{P\,+}(X) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (\overline{M}^+(F) - I)^T (M_i - \overline{X}_i)\phi_{i,T}^{P\,+}(X), \quad \text{if } X \in T^+, \tag{5.40a}$$

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_2(X) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} (M_i - X)\phi_{i,T}^{P\,-}(X) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} (\overline{M}^-(F) - I)^T (M_i - \overline{X}_i)\phi_{i,T}^{P\,-}(X), \quad \text{if } X \in T^-. \tag{5.40b}$$

It follows from the Lemma 3.5 that the two functions in (5.40) are independent of location of $\overline{X}_i \in l, i \in \mathcal{I}$. Furthermore, from the partition of unity stated in Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_1(X) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} M_i\phi_{i,T}^{P\,+}(X) - X + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (\overline{M}^+(F) - I)^T (M_i - \overline{X}_i)\phi_{i,T}^{P\,+}(X), \tag{5.41a}$$

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_2(X) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} M_i\phi_{i,T}^{P\,-}(X) - X + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} (\overline{M}^-(F) - I)^T (M_i - \overline{X}_i)\phi_{i,T}^{P\,-}(X), \tag{5.41b}$$

which imply that each component of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_1(X)$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_2(X)$ is a polynomial in Π_T because $\phi_{i,T}^{P\,s}(X) \in \Pi_T, s = \pm$, for $i \in \mathcal{I}$. We consider two auxiliary vector functions

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}^+(X) = \mathbf{\Lambda}_1(X), \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbf{\Lambda}^-(X) = (\overline{M}^+(F))^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_2(X). \tag{5.42}$$

Let $d(\mathbf{\Lambda}^s), s = \pm$ be the vector of the coefficients of the second degree term in each component of $\mathbf{\Lambda}^s$.

Lemma 5.4. *$\mathbf{\Lambda}^+$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}^-$ are such that $d(\mathbf{\Lambda}^+) = d(\mathbf{\Lambda}^-)$.*

Proof. Let $d(\phi_{i,T}^{P\,+}) = d(\phi_{i,T}^{P\,-}) = d_i$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$. By the partition of unity, $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} d_i = 0$. By using (3.14) given in Lemma 3.4 and using Lemma 3.5 to interchange $\overline{X}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$ with a fixed $\overline{X} \in l$ and, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\mathbf{\Lambda}^-) &= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} (\overline{M}^+(F))^T M_i d_i + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} (I - \overline{M}^+(F))^T (M_i - \overline{X}) d_i \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (\overline{M}^+(F))^T M_i d_i + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} M_i d_i - (I - \overline{M}^+(F))^T \overline{X} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} d_i \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} M_i d_i + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (\overline{M}^+(F) - I)^T M_i d_i + (I - \overline{M}^+(F))^T \overline{X} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} d_i \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} M_i d_i + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (\overline{M}^+(F) - I)^T (M_i - \overline{X}_i) d_i
\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly $d(\mathbf{\Lambda}^+)$. □

Lemma 5.5. *$\mathbf{\Lambda}^+$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}^-$ satisfy the condition* (5.5)*, i.e., $\mathbf{\Lambda}^+(X)|_l = \mathbf{\Lambda}^-(X)|_l$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{\Lambda}^s(X), s = \pm$ are independent of points $\overline{X}_i \in l, i \in \mathcal{I}$, we can replace these points by an arbitrary $\overline{X} \in l$ without changing values of $\mathbf{\Lambda}^s(X), s = \pm$. Then, since $\phi^P_{i,T}$ satisfies (5.5), applying (3.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{\Lambda}^+(\overline{X}) =& \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} (M_i - \overline{X})\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(\overline{X}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (\overline{M}^+(F) - I)^T (M_i - \overline{X})\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(\overline{X}) \\
=& \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} (M_i - \overline{X})\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(\overline{X}) + (\overline{M}^+(F))^T \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (M_i - \overline{X})\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(\overline{X}) \\
=& (\overline{M}^+(F))^T \left((\overline{M}^-(F))^T \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} (M_i - \overline{X})\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(\overline{X}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (M_i - \overline{X})\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(\overline{X}) \right) \\
=& (\overline{M}^+(F))^T \left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} (M_i - \overline{X})\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(\overline{X}) + (\overline{M}^-(F) - I)^T \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} (M_i - \overline{X})\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(\overline{X}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly $\mathbf{\Lambda}^-(\overline{X})$. □

Lemma 5.6. *$\mathbf{\Lambda}^+$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}^-$ satisfy the condition* (5.6)*, i.e., $\beta^+\nabla\mathbf{\Lambda}^+(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) = \beta^-\nabla\mathbf{\Lambda}^-(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F)$, where the gradient operator is understood as the gradient on each component.*

Proof. Again, Lemma 3.5 allows us to exchange $\overline{X}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$ for an arbitrary point $\overline{X} \in l$ in the discussion below. By (5.6), (5.39), (3.14), and (3.15) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^+\nabla\mathbf{\Lambda}^+(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) =& \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} M_i\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) \\
&+ (\overline{M}^+(F) - I)^T \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (M_i - \overline{X})\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) - \beta^+\mathbf{n}(F) \\
=& \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} M_i\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} \overline{X}\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) \\
&+ (\overline{M}^+(F))^T \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (M_i - \overline{X})\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) - \beta^+\mathbf{n}(F) \\
=& \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} (M_i - \overline{X})\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) + (\overline{M}^+(F))^T \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (M_i - \overline{X})\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) - \beta^+\mathbf{n}(F) \\
=& (\overline{M}^+(F))^T \left((\overline{M}^-(F))^T \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} (M_i - \overline{X})\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) \right. \\
&\left. + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (M_i - \overline{X})\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) - \beta^+(\overline{M}^-(F))^T\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) \right) \\
=& (\overline{M}^+(F))^T \left((\overline{M}^-(F))^T \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+} (M_i - \overline{X})\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) \right. \\
&\left. + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-} (M_i - \overline{X})\beta^-\nabla\phi^{P\,-}_{i,T}(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) - \beta^-\cdot\mathbf{n}(F) \right) = \beta^-\nabla\mathbf{\Lambda}^-(F)\cdot\mathbf{n}(F).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 5.3. *On every interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ we have*

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(M_i - X)\phi_{i,T}^{P}{}^{-}(X) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+}(\overline{M}^{-}(F) - I)^T(M_i - \overline{X}_i)\phi_{i,T}^{P}{}^{-}(X) = \mathbf{\Lambda}_1(X) = 0,\ \forall X \in T^-, \tag{5.43a}$$

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(M_i - X)\phi_{i,T}^{P}{}^{+}(X) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-}(\overline{M}^{+}(F) - I)^T(M_i - \overline{X}_i)\phi_{i,T}^{P}{}^{+}(X) = \mathbf{\Lambda}_2(X) = 0,\ \forall X \in T^+. \tag{5.43b}$$

and

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(M_i - X)\partial_d\phi_{i,T}^{P}{}^{-}(X) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^+}\left[(\overline{M}^{-}(F) - I)^T(M_i - \overline{X}_i)\partial_s\phi_{i,T}^{P}{}^{-}(X)\right] - \mathbf{e}_d = 0, \forall X \in T^-, \tag{5.44a}$$

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(M_i - X)\partial_d\phi_{i,T}^{P}{}^{+}(X) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^-}\left[(\overline{M}^{+}(F) - I)^T(M_i - \overline{X}_i)\partial_s\phi_{i,T}^{P}{}^{+}(X)\right] - \mathbf{e}_d = 0, \forall X \in T^+, \tag{5.44b}$$

where $d = 1, 2$, $\partial_1 = \partial_x, \partial_2 = \partial_y$ are partial differential operators, and $\mathbf{e}_d, d = 1, 2$ is the standard d-th unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Proof. We define a piecewise vector polynomial on T as

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}(X) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{\Lambda}^+(X) & \text{if } X \in T^+, \\ \mathbf{\Lambda}^-(X) & \text{if } X \in T^-. \end{cases}$$

First, the restriction of each component of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ to $T^s, s = \pm$ is a polynomial in Π_T. By Lemmas 5.4-5.6, the components of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ also satisfy (5.5) and (5.6). In addition, we can easily see that $\mathbf{\Lambda}(M_i) = \mathbf{0}, i \in \mathcal{I}$. Therefore, by the unisolvence stated in Theorem 5.1, we have $\mathbf{\Lambda}^+(X) = \mathbf{\Lambda}_1(X) \equiv 0$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}^-(X) = (\overline{M}^{+}(F))^T\mathbf{\Lambda}_2(X) \equiv 0$. Since $(\overline{M}^{+}(F))^T$ is nonsingular, we have $\mathbf{\Lambda}_2(X) \equiv 0$. Therefore (5.43) is proved.

The proof for (5.44) can be accomplished by differentiating (5.43) and applying (5.41). □

5.3 Optimal Approximation Capabilities of IFE Spaces

As usual, the local IFE spaces on elements can be employed to define the IFE function space globally on Ω as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S_h(\Omega) = \big\{ & v \in L^2(\Omega) : v|_T \in S_h^P(T); \\ & v|_{T_1}(M) = v|_{T_2}(M)\ \forall M \in \mathcal{N}_h, \forall\, T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_h \text{ such that } M \in T_1 \cap T_2 \big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.45}$$

Here $\mathcal{N}_h$ is the set of nodes on all the elements of $\mathcal{T}_h$. Our goal is to show that these IFE spaces formed above by linear, bilinear, CR and rotated-Q_1 polynomials have the optimal approximation property from the point of view how well the interpolation of a function u in these IFE spaces can approximate u. First we define the interpolation operator on an element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ as the mapping $I_{h,T} : C^0(T) \to S_h^P(T)$ such that

$$I_{h,T}^P u(X) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} u(M_i)\psi_{i,T}^P(X), & \text{if } T \in \mathcal{T}_h^n, \\ \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} u(M_i)\phi_{i,T}^P(X), & \text{if } T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i. \end{cases} \tag{5.46}$$

Furthermore, the global IFE interpolation $I_h^P : C^0(\Omega) \to S_h(\Omega)$ can be defined piecewisely as

$$(I_h^P u)|_T = I_{h,T}^P u, \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_h. \tag{5.47}$$

On every non-interface element $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^n$, the standard scaling argument [9, 12, 42] yields the following error estimate for the local interpolation $I_{h,T}^P u$ on T:

$$\|I_{h,T}^P u - u\|_{0,T} + h|I_{h,T}^P u - u|_{1,T} \leqslant Ch^2|u|_{2,T},\ \forall u \in H^2(T). \tag{5.48}$$

However, how to use the scaling argument to derive an error bound for the interpolation on an interface element is unclear because the local IFE space $S_h^P(T)$ is interface dependent and it is not even a subspace of $H^1(T)$ in general. Instead, we will use the multi-point Taylor expansion method [22, 23, 30, 44, 46] to derive estimates for the IFE interpolation error.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, assume $u \in PC_{int}^2(T)$. Then for any $\overline{X}_i \in l, i \in \mathcal{I}$, we have*

$$I_{h,T}^P u(X) - u(X) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} (E_i^s + F_i^s)\phi_{i,T}^P(X) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_i^s \phi_{i,T}^P(X),\ \forall X \in T^s,\ s = \pm, \tag{5.49a}$$

$$\partial_d(I_{h,T}^P u(X) - u(X)) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} (E_i^s + F_i^s)\partial_d\phi_{i,T}^P(X) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_i^s \partial_d\phi_{i,T}^P(X),\ \forall X \in T^s,\ s = \pm, \tag{5.49b}$$

where $d = 1$ or 2, R_i^s are given by (4.2) abd (4.4), and

$$\begin{aligned} E_i^s &= \Big((M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - \overline{M}^s(F))\nabla u^s(X)\Big) \cdot (M_i - \widetilde{Y}_i), \quad s = \pm,\ i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}, \\ F_i^s &= -\big((\overline{M}^s(F) - I)\nabla u^s(X)\big) \cdot (\widetilde{Y}_i - \overline{X}_i), \quad s = \pm,\ i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.50}$$

Proof. For $X \in T^s, s = \pm$, substituting the expansion (4.1) and (4.3) into the IFE interpolation (5.46), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{h,T}^P u(X) = {} & u^s(X) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \phi_{i,T}^P(X) + \nabla u^s(X) \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (M_i - X)\phi_{i,T}^P(X) \\ & + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} \Big(\Big(M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - I\Big)\nabla u^-(X)\Big) \cdot (M_i - \widetilde{Y}_i)\phi_{i,T}^P(X) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_i^s \phi_{i,T}^P(X),\ X \in T^s,\ s = \pm. \end{aligned} \tag{5.51}$$

From Theorem 5.3, we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (M_i - X)\phi_{i,T}^P(X) = -\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} (\overline{M}^s(F) - I)^T (M_i - \overline{X}_i)\phi_{i,T}^P(X),\ \forall X \in T^s,\ s = \pm. \tag{5.52}$$

Then, applying (5.52) and the partition of unity to (5.51) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} I_{h,T}^P u(X) = {} & u^s(X) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} \big((\overline{M}^s(F) - I)\nabla u^s(X)\big) \cdot (M_i - \overline{X}_i)\phi_{i,T}^P(X) \\ & + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} \Big(\Big(M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - I\Big)\nabla u^s(X)\Big) \cdot (M_i - \widetilde{Y}_i)\phi_{i,T}^P(X) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_i^s \phi_{i,T}^P(X),\ X \in T^s,\ s = \pm \end{aligned} \tag{5.53}$$

from which (5.49a) follows by using $M_i - \overline{X}_i = (M_i - \widetilde{Y}_i) + (\widetilde{Y}_i - \overline{X}_i)$. For (5.49b), applying the expansions (4.1) and (4.3) in $\partial_d I_{h,T}^P u(X) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} u(M_i)\partial_d\phi_{i,T}^P(X), d = 1, 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_d I_{h,T}^P u(X) = {} & u^s(X) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \partial_d\phi_{i,T}^P(X) + \nabla u^s(X) \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (M_i - X)\partial_d\phi_{i,T}^P(X) \\ & + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} \Big(\Big(M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - I\Big)\nabla u^s(X)\Big) \cdot (M_i - \widetilde{Y}_i)\partial_d\phi_{i,T}^P(X) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_i^s \partial_d\phi_{i,T}^P(X),\ \forall X \in T^s,\ s = \pm. \end{aligned} \tag{5.54}$$

Then, applying (5.39) and Theorem 5.3 to (5.54) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_d I_{h,T}^P u(X) = {} & \nabla u^s(X) \cdot \mathbf{e}_d - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} \big(\big(\overline{M}^s(F) - I\big)\nabla u^s(X)\big) \cdot (M_i - \overline{X}_i)\partial_d\phi_{i,T}^P(X) \\ & + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} \Big(\Big(M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - I\Big)\nabla u^s(X)\Big) \cdot (M_i - \widetilde{Y}_i)\partial_d\phi_{i,T}^P(X) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} R_i^s \partial_x\phi_{i,T}^P(X),\ \forall X \in T^s,\ s = \pm \end{aligned}$$

which leads to (5.49b) because $\nabla u^s(X) \cdot \mathbf{e}_d = \partial_d u^s(X)$ and $M_i - \overline{X}_i = (M_i - \tilde{Y}_i) + (\tilde{Y}_i - \overline{X}_i)$. □

By a similar argument in [46], we can estimate E_i^s and F_i^s in (5.50) by geometric properties established in Section 3.

Lemma 5.7. *There exist constants $C > 0$ independent of the interface location and $\beta^{\pm}$ such that the following estimates hold for every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ and $u \in PC_{int}^2(T)$:*

$$\|E_i^-\|_{0,T^-} \leqslant C\kappa h^2 |u|_{1,T^-}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}^+, \qquad \|E_i^+\|_{0,T^+} \leqslant C\frac{\kappa}{\rho} h^2 |u|_{1,T^+}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}^-. \tag{5.55a}$$

$$\|F_i^-\|_{0,T^-} \leqslant Ch^2 |u|_{1,T^-}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}^+, \qquad \|F_i^+\|_{0,T^+} \leqslant \frac{C}{\rho} h^2 |u|_{1,T^+}, \quad i \in \mathcal{I}^-. \tag{5.55b}$$

Proof. By $\|M_i - \widetilde{Y}_i\| \leqslant h$ and Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\|E_i^s\|_{0,T^s} \leqslant \|(M^s(\widetilde{Y}_i) - \overline{M}^s(F))\| \, \|\nabla u^s\|_{0,T^s} \, \|(M_i - \widetilde{Y}_j)\| \tag{5.56}$$

which implies the (5.55a) by (3.12) in Lemma 3.3. By Lemma 3.5, F_i^s is independent of the choice of $\overline{X}_i \in l$. Hence, by taking $\overline{X}_i = \widetilde{Y}_{i\perp}$ in F_i^s and applying Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\|F_i^s\|_{0,T^s} \leqslant \|\overline{M}^s(F) - I\| \, \|\nabla u^s\|_{0,T^s} \, \|\widetilde{Y}_i - \widetilde{Y}_{i\perp}\| \tag{5.57}$$

which establishes the second estimate in (5.55a) by (3.12). □

Now we are ready to prove the main result in this section.

Theorem 5.5. *Assume all the conditions required by Theorem 5.2 hold and $u \in PH_{int}^2(T)$. Then on every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$ the following hold.*

- *For rotated-Q_1 and Crouzeix-Raviart finite elements,*

$$\|I_{h,T}^P u - u\|_{0,T^-} + h|I_{h,T}^P u - u|_{1,T^-} \leqslant C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho} h^2 (|u|_{1,T} + |u|_{2,T}), \tag{5.58a}$$

$$\|I_{h,T}^P u - u\|_{0,T^+} + h|I_{h,T}^P u - u|_{1,T^+} \leqslant C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho^2} h^2 (|u|_{1,T} + |u|_{2,T}), \tag{5.58b}$$

  where C depends on λ chosen for rotated-Q_1 case in (5.24)*;*

- *For linear finite elements,*

$$\|I_{h,T}^P u - u\|_{0,T^-} + h|I_{h,T}^P u - u|_{1,T^-} \leqslant C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho} h^2 (|u|_{1,T} + |u|_{2,T}), \tag{5.59a}$$

$$\|I_{h,T}^P u - u\|_{0,T^+} + h|I_{h,T}^P u - u|_{1,T^+} \leqslant C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho^{3/2}} h^2 (|u|_{1,T} + |u|_{2,T}); \tag{5.59b}$$

- *For bilinear finite elements,*

$$\|I_{h,T}^P u - u\|_{0,T} + h|I_{h,T}^P u - u|_{1,T} \leqslant C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho} h^2 (|u|_{1,T} + |u|_{2,T}). \tag{5.60}$$

Proof. On each $T \in \mathcal{T}_h^i$, by Theorem 5.4, for every $u \in PC_{int}^2(T)$ we have

$$|I_{h,T}^P u - u|_{k,T^s} \leqslant \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{s'}} \left(\|E_i^s\|_{0,T^s} + \|F_i^s\|_{0,T^s}\right) |\phi_{i,T}^P|_{k,\infty,T^s} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \|R_i^s\|_{0,T^s} |\phi_{i,T}^P|_{k,\infty,T^s}, \tag{5.61}$$

where $k = 0, 1$. Then, applying Lemmas 4.2, 4.3, 5.7 and Theorem 5.2 for corresponding IFE functions to the inequality above, we obtain (5.58)-(5.60) for $u \in PC_{int}^2(T)$. Finally, the density hypothesis **(H4)** shows that (5.58)-(5.60) also holds for any $u \in PH_{int}^2(T)$. □

The local estimate in Theorem 5.5 leads to the following global estimate for the IFE interpolation directly.

Theorem 5.6. *For any $u \in PH_{int}^2(\Omega)$, the following estimate of interpolation error holds*

$$\|I_h^P u - u\|_{0,\Omega^s} + h|I_h^P u - u|_{1,\Omega^s} \leqslant \widetilde{C}^s h^2 (|u|_{1,\Omega} + |u|_{2,\Omega}), \quad s = \pm. \tag{5.62}$$

The constants $\widetilde{C}$ depending on κ and ρ is specified as the following:

- *for the rotated-Q_1 and Crouzeix-Raviart IFE space,*

$$\widetilde{C}^- = C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho}, \quad \widetilde{C}^+ = C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho^2}, \tag{5.63}$$

  where C depends on λ for rotated-Q_1 case;

- *for the linear IFE space,*

$$\widetilde{C}^- = C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho}, \quad \widetilde{C}^+ = C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho^{3/2}}; \tag{5.64}$$

- *for the bilinear IFE space,*

$$\widetilde{C}^- = \widetilde{C}^+ = C\frac{1+\kappa}{\rho}. \tag{5.65}$$

Proof. Estimate (5.62) follows directly from combining the estimates (5.58) to (5.60) and (5.48). □

6 Numerical Examples

In this section we use numerical examples to demonstrate the approximation capability of the IFE spaces by IFE interpolation and IFE solutions. All the computations are carried in the domain $\Omega = (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1)$ in which the interface curve Γ is a circle with radius $r_0 = \pi/6.28$ which divides Ω into two subdomains Ω^- and Ω^+ with

$$\Omega^- = \{(x, y) : x^2 + y^2 < r_0^2\}.$$

The function to be approximated is

$$u(x, y) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{\beta^-} r^\alpha, & (x, y) \in \Omega^-, \\ \dfrac{1}{\beta^+} r^\alpha + \left(\dfrac{1}{\beta^-} - \dfrac{1}{\beta^+}\right) r_0^\alpha, & (x, y) \in \Omega^+, \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

where $r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$ and $\alpha = 5$. It is easy to verify that u satisfies the interface jump condition (1.3) and (1.4). We note that this is the same interface problem for the numerical examples given in [37]. Numerical

examples presented here are generated with the bilinear IFE space developed in Section 5, and we note that numerical results with other IFE spaces developed in Section 5 are similar which are therefore not presented in order to avoid redundancy.

Note that the curvature of the interface in this interface problem is $\kappa \approx 2$. Condition (5.23) allows us to use $\bar{\kappa} \approx 0.031$. Then using $\epsilon \approx 0.4$ in (3.6) leads to a suggested bound for the mesh size $h \approx 0.0273$. Therefore, we our numerical experiments presented in this section are all on meshes whose sizes are not larger than $1/40 = 0.025$ which can sufficiently satisfy conditions in the error estimation in the previous section.

The convergence of IFE interpolation: Table 1 and Table 2 present interpolation error $u - I_h u$ in both the L^2 and the semi-H^1 norms over a sequence of meshes whose mesh size is h. In these tables, the rate is the estimated values of r such that $\|u - I_h u\|_{0,\Omega} = Ch^r$ or $|u - I_h u|_{1,\Omega} = Ch^r$ with numerical results generated on two consecutive meshes. The estimated values for r clearly demonstrate the optimal convergence of $I_h u$. We note that this example involves a coefficient β with a jump quite large. Our numerical experiments show that these IFE spaces converge optimally also when β has a moderate jump such as $\beta^- = 1, \beta^+ = 10$.

h	$\|u - I_h u\|_{0,\Omega}$	rate	$\|u - I_h u\|_{1,\Omega}$	rate
1/40	2.7681E-4		1.4482E-2	
1/80	7.2447E-4	1.9339	7.4468E-3	0.9596
1/160	1.8580E-5	1.9632	3.7827E-3	0.9772
1/320	4.7122E-6	1.9793	1.9061E-3	0.9888
1/640	1.1858E-6	1.9906	9.5723E-4	0.9937
1/1280	2.9744E-7	1.9952	4.7965E-4	0.9969

Table 1: Interpolation errors and rates for the bilinear IFE function, $\beta^- = 1$ and $\beta^+ = 10000$

h	$\|u - I_h u\|_{0,\Omega}$	rate	$\|u - I_h u\|_{1,\Omega}$	rate
1/40	9.0663E-3		4.3850E-1	
1/80	2.2680E-3	1.9991	2.1939E-1	0.9991
1/160	5.6711E-4	1.9997	1.0971E-1	0.9998
1/320	1.4179E-4	1.9999	5.4859E-2	0.9999
1/640	3.5447E-5	2.0000	2.7430E-2	1.0000
1/1280	8.8618E-6	2.0000	1.3715E-2	1.0000

Table 2: Interpolation errors and rates for the bilinear IFE function, $\beta^- = 10000$ and $\beta^+ = 1$

The convergence of the IFE solution: Let u_h be the IFE solution generated by the bilinear IFE space applied in the partially penalized method in [37] for the interface problem (1.1)-(1.4) where f and g are chosen such that u given by (6.1) is its exact solution. The errors in the bilinear IFE solution generated by the symmetric partially penalized IFE method on a sequence of meshes are listed in Tables 3 and 4. The values of numerically estimated rate r in these tables clearly indicate the optimal convergence of the bilinear IFE solution gauged in either the L^2 norm or H^1 norm. We also have carried out extensive numerical experiments by applying the IFE spaces developed in Section 5 to the partially penalized IFE methods in [37] with all the popular penalties, and we have observed similar optimal convergence in the related IFE solution for this interface problem.

	SPP IFE		SPP IFE	
h	$\|u-u_h\|_{0,\Omega}$	rate	$\|u-u_h\|_{1,\Omega}$	rate
1/40	3.7917E-4		1.5276E-2	
1/80	1.0409E-4	1.8650	7.9599E-3	0.9405
1/160	2.5628E-5	2.0220	3.9096E-3	1.0257
1/320	6.6828E-6	1.9392	1.9501E-3	1.0035
1/640	1.7806E-6	1.9081	9.7745E-4	0.9964
1/1280	4.0278E-7	2.1443	4.8374E-4	1.0148

Table 3: Errors in the bilinear IFE solution generated by the symmetric partially penalized IFE method, $\beta^- = 1$, $\beta^+ = 10000$.

	SPP IFE		SPP IFE	
h	$\|u-u_h\|_{0,\Omega}$	rate	$\|u-u_h\|_{1,\Omega}$	rate
1/40	1.0734E-2		4.4052E-1	
1/80	2.5715E-3	2.0616	2.1966E-1	1.0040
1/160	6.2918E-4	2.0310	1.0974E-1	1.0012
1/320	1.5709E-4	2.0019	5.4864E-2	1.0001
1/640	4.0137E-5	1.9686	2.7431E-2	1.0000
1/1280	9.8101E-6	2.0326	1.3715E-2	1.0000

Table 4: Errors in the bilinear IFE solution generated by the symmetric partially penalized IFE method, $\beta^- = 10000$, $\beta^+ = 1$.

References

[1] Slimane Adjerid, Nabil Chaabane, and Tao Lin. An immersed discontinuous finite element method for stokes interface problems. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 293:170–190, 2015. in press.

[2] Ivo Babuška. The finite element method for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients. *Computing (Arch. Elektron. Rechnen)*, 5:207–213, 1970.

[3] Ivo Babuška, Uday Banerjee, and John E. Osborn. Survey of meshless and generalized finite element methods: a unified approach. *Acta Numer.*, 12:1–125, 2003.

[4] Ivo Babuška and Zhimin Zhang. The partition of unity method for the elastically supported beam. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 152(1-2):1–18, 1998. Symposium on Advances in Computational Mechanics, Vol. 5 (Austin, TX, 1997).

[5] John W. Barrett and Charles M. Elliott. Fitted and unfitted finite-element methods for elliptic equations with smooth interfaces. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 7(3):283–300, 1987.

[6] Peter Bastian and Christian Engwer. An unfitted finite element method using discontinuous Galerkin. *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg.*, 79(12):1557–1576, 2009.

[7] Dietrich Braess. *Finite elements*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2001. Theory, fast solvers, and applications in solid mechanics, Translated from the 1992 German edition by Larry L. Schumaker.

[8] James H. Bramble and J. Thomas King. A finite element method for interface problems in domains with smooth boundaries and interfaces. *Adv. Comput. Math.*, 6(2):109–138, 1996.

[9] Susanne C. Brenner and L. Ridgway Scott. *The mathematical theory of finite element methods*, volume 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[10] Erik Burman, Johnny Guzmán, Manuel A. Sánchez, and Marcus Sarkis. Robust flux error estimation of nitsches method for high contrast interface problems. *arXiv:1602.00603v1*, 2016.

[11] Zhiming Chen and Jun Zou. Finite element methods and their convergence for elliptic and parabolic interface problems. *Numer. Math.*, 79(2):175–202, 1998.

[12] Philippe G. Ciarlet. *The finite element method for elliptic problems*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1978. Studies in Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 4.

[13] Ray. W. Clough and James L. Tocher. Finite element stiffness matrices for analysis of plate bending. In *Matrix Methods in Structual Mechanics*, pages 515–545, 1966.

[14] M. Crouzeix and P.-A. Raviart. Conforming and nonconforming finite element methods for solving the stationary Stokes equations. I. *Rev. Française Automat. Informat. Recherche Opérationnelle Sér. Rouge*, 7(R-3):33–75, 1973.

[15] John Dolbow, Nicolas Moës, and Ted Belytschko. An extended finite element method for modeling crack growth with frictional contact. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 190(51-52):6825–6846, 2001.

[16] Yalchin Efendiev and Thomas Y. Hou. *Multiscale finite element methods*, volume 4 of *Surveys and Tutorials in the Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, 2009. Theory and applications.

[17] Yan Gong, Bo Li, and Zhilin Li. Immersed-interface finite-element methods for elliptic interface problems with nonhomogeneous jump conditions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 46(1):472–495, 2007/08.

[18] Grégory Guyomarc'h, Chang-Ock Lee, and Kiwan Jeon. A discontinuous Galerkin method for elliptic interface problems with application to electroporation. *Comm. Numer. Methods Engrg.*, 25(10):991–1008, 2009.

[19] Johnny Guzmán, Manuel A. Sánchez, and Marcus Sarkis. A finite element method for high-contrast interface problems with error estimates independent of contrast. *arXiv:1507.03873v2*, 2015.

[20] Johnny Guzmán, Manuel A. Sánchez, and Marcus Sarkis. On the accuracy of finite element approximations to a class of interface problems. *Mathematics of Computation*, 2015. (to appear).

[21] Anita Hansbo and Peter Hansbo. An unfitted finite element method, based on Nitsche's method, for elliptic interface problems. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 191(47-48):5537–5552, 2002.

[22] Xiaoming He. *Bilinear immersed finite elements for interface problems*. PhD thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2009.

[23] Xiaoming He, Tao Lin, and Yanping Lin. Approximation capability of a bilinear immersed finite element space. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 24(5):1265–1300, 2008.

[24] Xiaoming He, Tao Lin, and Yanping Lin. A bilinear immersed finite volume element method for the diffusion equation with discontinuous coefficient. *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, 6(1):185–202, 2009.

[25] Xiaoming He, Tao Lin, Yanping Lin, and Xu Zhang. Immersed finite element methods for parabolic equations with moving interface. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 29(2):619–646, 2013.

[26] Songming Hou, Zhilin Li, Liqun Wang, and Wei Wang. A numerical method for solving elasticity equations with interfaces. *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, 12(2):595–612, 2012.

[27] R. Kafafy, J. Wang, and T. Lin. A hybrid-grid immersed-finite-element particle-in-cell simulation model of ion optics plasma dynamics. *Dyn. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Syst. Ser. B Appl. Algorithms*, 12(Suppl. Vol. 12b):1–16, 2005.

[28] Raed Kafafy and Joseph Wang. Whole ion optics gridlet simulations using a hybrid-grid immersed-finite-element particle-in-cell code. *J. Propulsion Power*, 23(1):59–68, 2007.

[29] Do Y. Kwak, Kye T. Wee, and Kwang S. Chang. An analysis of a broken P_1-nonconforming finite element method for interface problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 48(6):2117–2134, 2010.

[30] Z. Li, T. Lin, Y. Lin, and R. C. Rogers. An immersed finite element space and its approximation capability. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 20(3):338–367, 2004.

[31] Zhilin Li. The immersed interface method using a finite element formulation. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 27(3):253–267, 1998.

[32] Zhilin Li, Tao Lin, and Xiaohui Wu. New Cartesian grid methods for interface problems using the finite element formulation. *Numer. Math.*, 96(1):61–98, 2003.

[33] Zhilin Li and Xingzhou Yang. An immersed finite element method for elasticity equations with interfaces. In *Recent advances in adaptive computation*, volume 383 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 285–298. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.

[34] T. Lin, Y. Lin, W.-W. Sun, and Z. Wang. Immersed finite element methods for 4th order differential equations. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 235(13):3953–3964, 2011.

[35] Tao Lin, Yanping Lin, Robert Rogers, and M. Lynne Ryan. A rectangular immersed finite element space for interface problems. In *Scientific computing and applications (Kananaskis, AB, 2000)*, volume 7 of *Adv. Comput. Theory Pract.*, pages 107–114. Nova Sci. Publ., Huntington, NY, 2001.

[36] Tao Lin, Yanping Lin, and Xu Zhang. A method of lines based on immersed finite elements for parabolic moving interface problems. *Adv. Appl. Math. Mech.*, 5(4):548–568, 2013.

[37] Tao Lin, Yanping Lin, and Xu Zhang. Partially penalized immersed finite element methods for elliptic interface problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 53(2):1121–1144, 2015.

[38] Tao Lin, Dongwoo Sheen, and Xu Zhang. A locking-free immersed finite element method for planar elasticity interface problems. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 247:228–247, 2013.

[39] Tao Lin and Joseph Wang. An immersed finite element electric field solver for ion optics modeling. In *Proceedings of AIAA Joint Propulsion Conference*, Indianapolis, IN, Jul 2002. AIAA.

[40] J. M. Melenk and I. Babuška. The partition of unity finite element method: basic theory and applications. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 139(1-4):289–314, 1996.

[41] Kihyo Moon. *Immersed Discontinuous Galerkin Methods for Acoustic Wave Propagation in Inhomogeneous Media*. PhD thesis, Virginia Tech, 2016.

[42] R. Rannacher and S. Turek. Simple nonconforming quadrilateral Stokes element. *Numer. Methods Partial Differential Equations*, 8(2):97–111, 1992.

[43] Sylvain Vallaghé and Théodore Papadopoulo. A trilinear immersed finite element method for solving the electroencephalography forward problem. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 32(4):2379–2394, 2010.

[44] Jinchao Xu. Estimate of the convergence rate of the finite element solutions to elliptic equation of second order with discontinuous coefficients. *Natural Science Journal of Xiangtan University*, 1:1–5, 1982.

[45] Xingzhou Yang, Bo Li, and Zhilin Li. The immersed interface method for elasticity problems with interfaces. *Dyn. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Syst. Ser. A Math. Anal.*, 10(5):783–808, 2003. Progress in partial differential equations (Pullman, WA, 2002).

[46] Xu Zhang. *Nonconforming Immersed Finite Element Methods for Interface Problems*. PhD thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2013.